



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

gard to her operations in Abyssinia, nor would she have any rights against us if we were to attempt to share in the partition of Africa.

In the case of Turkey, if we were to seize the whole of Asia Minor and establish peace and order there (as the British have done, in substance, in Egypt), we should have invaded no right of any power except Turkey.

The same is, of course, true in respect of our relations and conduct with the states of the western hemisphere under the Monroe doctrine, or under any other policy that we may think it just to adopt.

It was, then, the clear and perfectly understood distinction between the rights of one nation against another, and their interests and policies in regard to other nations, that doubtless led to a separate treaty in regard to the Venezuelan question; for both governments knew that the affair could not possibly come within the scope of the general treaty.

You will see, therefore, that the phrase of the treaty which is criticised is the most apt possible to mark the boundary of arbitration, and that it leaves the Monroe doctrine unaffected.

The second objection is the fear that the treaty may affect our attitude in regard to the Nicaragua canal, in which the interests of the United States are so deeply concerned. What I have already said disposes of that solicitude; I have no time to go into detail about it.

The third and last objection I have heard is the supposed danger of leaving it to any European power to name an umpire in certain contingencies. It is enough to say that, so far as our considerable experience has gone in such matters, we have never had occasion to complain of the action of any sovereign in naming an umpire or in deciding a dispute.

In the great arbitration treaty of 1871 we agreed that three members of the Geneva tribunal should be named by three sovereigns, two of them Europeans, and that if any or all of these sovereigns should fail to name these members, the King of Sweden should name them all. And, in the same treaty, we did not hesitate to submit the very important question of our boundary on the Pacific coast to the Emperor of Germany.

I am an intense supporter of the Monroe doctrine. I believe the building of the Nicaragua canal under the auspices of the United States to be of urgent necessity.

I believe most earnestly in international arbitration to the utmost extent that civilized, just and self-respecting nations can go; and I most earnestly hope that the Senate will ratify the treaty as it is proposed as the first step—very great and auspicious—toward the attainment of peace among nations."

THE BEST THAT HAS YET BEEN SUGGESTED.

BY HON. CHARLES P. DAILY OF NEW YORK.

I have read the proposed treaty agreed upon by the two plenipotentiaries, and now submitted to the Senate of the United States for ratification, and having, during the last two years, taken an active part in the effort to bring about the settlement of all controversies that may hereafter arise between the two English-speaking nations—Great Britain and the United States—by the final arbitrament of a fixed tribunal, and being familiar, I think, with all the plans suggested for that purpose by individuals and collective bodies, I have no hesitation in saying

that, in my opinion, it is the best that has yet been suggested.

I have been struck by its simplicity and clearness, by how much has been foreseen and provided for, and am satisfied in my own mind that, as a means of preventing war, with all its attendant calamities (except where war is inevitable), it will work most satisfactorily. It is difficult, beforehand, to see all the exigencies that may arise; and for that reason it is better, in my judgment, to ratify the treaty as it is now framed, leaving all such exigencies to be disclosed during the five or six years of its operation, than for the Senate to provide for them now. In a matter of this kind, which is new, experience is the best guide. As the treaty is to be in operation only a few years, it may result in its being made still more perfect.

I now answer certain questions put to me by the representative of *The Independent*:

Do you think Russia will use her influence against the ratification of the treaty? I do not believe she will attempt to do so.

If arbitration is a desirable thing should it not be incorporated into international law for more than five years? As I have already remarked, the treaty will undoubtedly be improved and made entirely satisfactory, such alterations and changes being made as experience will suggest.

Can it be considered as a treaty of offense and defense, and does it commit the two countries to an alliance? I do not think any such question is involved.

Would the United States be in danger of losing control of the Nicaragua Canal, if it should be built? Would Great Britain claim that, under the Clayton Bulwer treaty, she was entitled to a voice in the control of the canal? I answer, no. As I have been largely connected with the matter of the Nicaragua Canal, as a member of the company that has heretofore done what has been done toward the construction of that great waterway between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and have also been an officer of that company since its incorporation, I anticipate no difficulty of that kind. I think I may consider myself thoroughly well informed on this subject, having had constant occasion for some years carefully to study and consider it.

Would King Oscar, of Sweden, be satisfactory to our country, and be likely to be impartial, as the final arbitrator? I think the selection is excellent, as he is one of the most enlightened, liberal and capable sovereigns of Europe.—*The Independent*.

ONE OF THE GREATEST EVENTS OF MODERN HISTORY.

BY REV. REUEN THOMAS, D.D.

From a sermon in Harvard Church Brookline, Mass., Jan. 24.

As it seems to me that the arbitration treaty between Great Britain and the United States is one of the greatest events of modern history, and closely connected with the advancement of the Kingdom of Christ among men, its introduction into our solemn sanctuary service is abundantly warranted. Indeed, it would indicate a great lack of ability to see the movements of Divine Providence in their broadest expression if we omitted to celebrate an event so rich in promise for humanity as this is. It is true that this treaty is not yet approved by